

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated February 26, 2003, (paper no. 4) the Examiner rejected claims 15-17 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time that the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner stated that the specification lacks "splitting the multimedia stream" of claims 15 and 23. The Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lou et al. (U.S. patent no. 6,370,666, hereinafter referred to as "Lou"). The Examiner rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lou. The rejections and objections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 15-17 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. In particular, the Examiner stated that the specification lacks the "splitting the multimedia stream" of claims 15 and 23. The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. Claims 15 and 23 provide a method for transmitting multimedia information that includes receiving a multimedia stream, at a mobile station in claim 15, and splitting the multimedia stream into component pieces. The application provides, on page 8, lines 11-18, that "[s]ignals 305, 307, and 309 can be originated from a computer connected to a mobile station that includes multimedia application 300. These signals may be in their component types when leaving the computer, or may be multiplexed by the computer. In this situation, the multiplexed signal first passes through a demultiplexor that splits the signal into its component multimedia parts." Accordingly, the applicants contend that the limitations of "splitting the multimedia stream" of claims 15 and 23 are taught by the specification and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 15-17 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lou. Specifically, with respect to claim 1, the Examiner stated that Lou discloses a receiver 50 comprising channel decoders 64, 70 (receiving and decoding multiple

streams) wherein decoder 64 is associated with audio (content), decoder 70 is associated with video (content) that is combined by combiner 66 and formed at speaker/display 72 (col. 5, lines 18-33) (multimedia), and wherein the supporting network is the Internet (session) (col. 1, line 28). The Examiner further stated that each of channel decoders 64, 70 performs FEC operations (Layer 2 functionality).

The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of Lou. Nowhere does Lou disclose separately coding and decoding multiple streams which together form a multimedia session. Instead, Lou merely teaches twice interleaving and coding, and de-interleaving and decoding, a same or substantially similar stream. In a first transmission of a stream, the data is interleaved by a first interleaver over a first delay length. In a second transmission of the stream, the data is interleaved by a second interleaver over a second delay length that is shorter than the first delay length. As a result, the first transmission of the stream is better protected against errors due to fading but takes longer to de-interleave by a receiver, perhaps taking as long as four seconds.

When the data is received by a receiver system of Lou, the receiver system first displays the second transmission of the data in order to minimize the waiting period for a receiver system user who is tuning to the channel. When the first transmission of the data is ready for display, the receiver system then converts over to displaying the first transmission. These are two complete, self-contained streams of session data, not the multiple streams which together form a multimedia session as claimed in claim 1. That is, in Lou, the lower layer protocols, that is, Layer 1, Layer 2, and Layer 3, are not aware of the contents of the data that they transfer, such as voice, video, or data, and do not differentiate the lower layer services provided based on the contents of the data that is being concurrently transferred during a multimedia session. In fact, Lou teaches nothing concerning the multiple data streams that are concurrently transferred during a multimedia session and, as a result, nowhere teaches the lower layers providing services, such as channel coding and decoding, that are differentiated based on the contents of the data that is being concurrently transferred during a multimedia session. Therefore, nowhere does Lou teach the limitations of claim 1 of decoding, based upon the content of each individual stream, the multiple streams of a multimedia session to form multiple

decoded streams, and performing Layer 2 functionality upon each of the multiple decoded streams. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 1 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 2-14 depend upon allowable claim 1, the applicants respectfully request that claims 2-14 may now be passed to allowance.

Claims 15, 21, and 23 each includes limitations of splitting a multimedia stream into component pieces, applying Layer 2 protocol to the component pieces, and applying channel coding to the component pieces. As noted above, these limitations are not taught by Lou. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claims 15, 21, and 23 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 16 and 17 depend upon allowable claim 15, the applicants respectfully request that claims 16 and 17 may now be passed to allowance.

Claim 18 includes limitations of decoding, based upon a content of each individual stream, multiple multimedia streams and performing a Layer 2 functionality upon each of the decoded streams. As noted above, these limitations are not taught by Lou. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 18 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 19-20 depend upon allowable claim 18, the applicants respectfully request that claims 19-20 may now be passed to allowance.

With respect to claim 24, the Examiner states that Lou teaches a wireless network that includes multiple base stations and a controller for coverage. However, nowhere does Lou teach, nor does the Examiner contend that Lou teaches, the limitations of claim 24 of a mobile station coupled to the network and including multiple multimedia ports and a computer coupled to the mobile station and including a multimedia port coupled to the mobile station. Accordingly, Lou does not teach the limitations of claim 24 and the applicants respectfully request that claim 24 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 25-27 depend upon allowable claim 24, the applicants respectfully request that claims 25-27 may now be passed to allowance.

As the applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen L. Spear, et al.

By: 

Steven A. May
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,912
Phone No.: 847/576-3635
Fax No.: 847/576-3750